

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02989 300059Z

64

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 ACDA-19 CU-04 OMB-01

AEC-11 AECE-00 DRC-01 /155 W  
----- 079332

P R 292330Z MAY 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 5970

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 4038

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USDOCOSOUTH

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USMISSION GENEVA

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 2989

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: NATO, PARM, PFOR, MARR

SUBJECT: CSCE CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES: APPLICATION ON  
SOVIET TERRITORY

GENEVA FOR CSCE DEL

VIENNA FOR MBFR DEL

REF: A. USNATO 2895

B. GENEVA 3325

SUMMARY: POLADS ON MAY 28 MOVED FURTHER TOWARD JOINT VIEW THAT  
APPLYING CBM'S ONLY IN 500-700 KM BAND OF SOVIET BORDER TERRITORY  
WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE FALLBACK POSITION FOR ALLIES, BUT TREATMENT  
OF TURKISH TERRITORY ADJOINING NON-CSCE COUNTRIES REMAINS AT  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 02989 300059Z

ISSUE. U.S. REP OBSERVED THAT EXCLUSION OF PARTS OF TURKISH  
TERRITORY MIGHT RAISE QUESTIONS ABOUT APPLYING CBM'S TO U.S.  
STATIONED FORCESS. RECOGNIZING SPECIAL TURKISH PROBLEM, SEVERAL  
REPS SECONDED UK THOUGHT THAT CBM'S ON BOTH SIDES OF SOVIET-

TURKISH CAUCASIAN BORDER COULD BE DEALT WITH UNDER "SEPARATE REGIME." ACTION REQUESTED: PROMPT GUIDANCE IF THERE ARE ANY DIFFICULTIES IN WASHINGTON WITH EMERGING CONSENSUS ON CBM APPLICATION TO USSR. FURTHER POLADS MEETING ON SUBJECT MAYBE HELD LATER THIS WEEK IF TUKS RECEIVE INSTRUCTIONS. END SUMMARY.

1. POLADS ON MAY 28 CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF APPLICATION OF CBM'S ON SOVIET TERRITORY (REF A). CANADIAN, NETHERLANDS, AND UK REPS ALL EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT TURKISH POSITION (NEED TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN AREAS OF TURKEY FROM APPLICATION OF CBM'S BECAUSE OF BORDERS WITH NON-CSCE PARTICIPANTS), SINCE THIS MIGHT GIVE SOVIETS GROUNDS TO REJECT A 500-700 KM BORDER BAND FOR CBM'S IN SOVIET TERRITORY. CANADIAN REP SUGGESTED THAT ZONE OF CBM APPLICATION IN TURKEY MIGHT BE MEASURED ONLY EASTWARD FROM BULGARIAN BORDER AND AEGEAN SEA COAST, AND NOT SOUTHWARDS FROM BLACK SEA AND CAUCASIAN FRONTIER. NETHERLANDS REPS WONDERED INSTEAD IF A RELATIVE FORMULA COULD BE DEVELOPED FOR APPLYING CBM'S TO USSR AND TURKISH TERRITORY--I.E. APPLICATION OF CBM'S TO SAME PRO-PORTION OR PERCENTAGE OF TURKISH TERRITORY AS THE PORTION OF EUROPEAN USSR THAT WOULD BE COMPREHENDED IN A 500/700 KM FRONTIER ZONE.

2. TURKISH REP STATED THAT TURKEY IS PRESENTLY PREPARED TO ACCEPT CBM'S ON AT LEAST PART OF ITS TERRITORY, INCLUDING ALL OF TURKISH THRACE, AND MOST COASTAL AREAS. HOWEVER, AS AN EXAMPLE OF REASONS FOR NOT APPLYING THEM TO ALL ITS TERRITORY, IN PARTICULAR NON-EUROPEAN FRONTIER AREAS, TURKISH REP CITED KURDISH PROBLEM.

3. U.S. REP OBSERVED THAT EXCLUSION OF PARTS OF TURKISH TERRITORY FROM CBM'S MIGHT ALSO RAISE CERTAIN QUESTIONS WITH REGARD TO U.S. FORCES STATIONED IN TURKEY. ALTHOUGH U.S. WAS NOT SEEKING TO EXCLUDE ANY PARTS OF EUROPEAN TERRITORY FROM OPERATION OF CBM'S WITH REGARD TO ITS OWN FORCES, QUESTION WOULD COME UP WHETHER CBM'S WOULD APPLY TO FORCES OF OTHERS ON TERRITORY EXCLUDED FROM CBM'S BY HOST COUNTRY. E.G., WOULD U.S. OR TURKEY BE OBLIGED TO NOTIFY OTHERS OF U.S. AIR ELEMENTS PARTICIPATING IN ANY (HYPOTHETICAL) COMBINED MANEUVERS IN AN EXCLUDED AREA?  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 02989 300059Z

4. UK REP SAID THERE MIGHT BE A CASE FOR SETTING ASIDE TURKISH-SOVIET BORDER AREA FOR A "SEPARATE REGIME" ON APPLICATION OF CBM'S ON GROUNDS THAT EUROPE MEETS ASIA IN THAT REGION. SEVERAL OTHER REPS EXPRESSED FAVORABLE INTEREST IN THIS UK APPROACH FOR RESOLVING DISPARATE SOVIET AND TURKISH CBM PROBLEMS.

5. FRG REP SAID ALLIES SHOULD BE PREPARED FOR POSSIBILITY OF A BREAK IN GENEVA LOGJAM, AND SHOULD NOT ATTEMPT TO "FORMALIZE" EMERGING CONSENSUS ON CBM APPLICATION. TURKISH AND GREEK REPS OBJECTED, SINCE THEY LACKED CURRENT INSTRUCTIONS. FRG REP ASKED THEM TO SEEK INSTRUCTION URGENTLY, AND PROPOSED THAT POLACS MEET AGAIN ON SUBJECT LATER IN WEEK, IF POSSIBLE.

6. CHAIRMAN SAID TENTATIVE CONSENSUS, SUBJECT TO EXPLICIT RESERVATIONS OF THOSE STILL SEEKING INSTRUCTIONS, WAS THAT ALLIES SHOULD MAINTAIN PRESENT POSITION FAVORING APPLICATION OF CBM'S IN ALL OF EUROPE, AND WAIT FOR SPECIFIC EASTERN COUNTERPROPOSALS (WHICH, JUDGING FROM REF B, RECEIVED AFTER POLADS MEETING, HAVE NOW BEEN PUT FORTH FORMALLY IN GENEVA). AT THE APPROPRIATE TIME, ALLIES MIGHT STATE THAT THE APPLICATION OF CBM'S IN A 700KM (EVENTUALLY 500 KM) BAND OF SOVIET BORDER TERRITORY WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE COMPROMISE. HOWEVER, ALLIES SHOULD ALSO BEAR IN MIND THAT TURKEY HAS A SPECIAL PROBLEM, AND CONSEQUENTLY THAT TURKISH-SOVIET BORDER AREA MIGHT BE DEALT WITH SEPARATELY FOR CBM PURPOSES.

7. DUE TO CONTINUING RESERVATION ON PART OF TURKEY, POLADS AGREED THAT CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT WOULD NOT YET BE RECORDED, AND THAT, DEPENDING ON TURKISH INSTRUCTIONS, ANOTHER MEETING ON SUBJECT COULD BE HELD LATER THIS WEEK.

8. ACTION REQUESTED: WE WILL NEED PROMPT GUIDANCE IF AN ALLIED POSITION ALONG LINES STATED BY CHAIRMAN IN PARA 6 ABOVE IS NOT ACCEPTABLE TO WASHINGTON. AS FOR PARTICIPATION BY U. S. FORCES IN MANEUVERS IN ANY PART OF TURKEY THAT MIGHT BE EXCLUDED FROM APPLICATION OF CBM'S WE ASSUME THAT U.S. WOULD HAVE TO FOLLOW TURKS AND REJECT OBLIGATION TO NOTIFY IN ADVANCE OR ADMIT OBSERVERS. WE WOULD APPRECIATE CONFIRMATION. IN ADDITION, U.S. G. MAY WISH TO CLEAR ANY OFFICIAL VIEWS ON THIS POINT BILATERALLY WITH TURKS BEFORE WE MAKE ANY STATEMENT ON INSTRUCTIONS HERE. RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 29 MAY 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** golinofr  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO02989  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740587/abbryvfp.tel  
**Line Count:** 136  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. USNATO 2895 B. GENEVA 3325  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** golinofr  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 27 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by collinp0>; APPROVED <08 MAY 2002 by golinofr>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES: APPLICATION ON SOVIET TERRITORY  
**TAGS:** NATO, PARM, PFOR, MARR  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS  
MOSCOW  
VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USDOCOSOUTH  
USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR  
GENEVA  
CINCLANT

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005